



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,112	05/24/2001	Marc Robidas	SYCS-014	3043
959	7590	03/24/2005	EXAMINER	
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP. 28 STATE STREET BOSTON, MA 02109			VINCENT, DAVID ROBERT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2661	

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

**Application No.**

09/865,112

**Applicant(s)**

ROBIDAS ET AL.

**Examiner**

David R Vincent

**Art Unit**

2661

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)            |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____  |

***Claim Objections***

1. Claims 19-21 are objected to because of the following informalities: claim 19 line 4, specifies "first" and it should specify second. See e.g., claim 21, line 2. Appropriate correction is required.

**Background Material**

The examiner takes official notice the following is merely well known details of routing. In a L-S protocol a router does not exchange distances with its neighbors. Instead, each router actively tests the status of its link to each of its neighbors. Then it sends this data to its other neighbors, which then propagate it throughout the autonomous system. Each router takes this L-S information and builds a complete routing table. This is how topology discovery is performed when using a L-S protocol. The L-S protocols will always converge/stabilize faster than D-V protocols after something changes. When using a L-S algorithm, all routers will have identical routing databases (DBs), each DB will describe the complete topology, and each router can use its DB to derive the shortest paths to all destinations, possibly using the Dijkstra least-cost algorithm. Two protocols, which use a L-S algorithm, are OSPF and IS-IS.

**OSPF: Open Shortest Path First**

The OSPF protocol was based on the early version of the IS-IS protocol and is a L-S protocol, which operates directly over IP. It does not use TCP or UDP. OSPF has its own value for the

Art Unit: 2661

protocol field in the IP header. It can calculate a separate set of routes for each IP type-of-service (TOS). This means that for any destination there can be multiple routing table entries. Each interface is assigned a dimensionless cost. This can be assigned based on throughput, round trip time, reliability, or whatever. When several routes have the same cost, OSPF can perform *load balancing* (distributing traffic equally among the routes). OSPF supports subnets and using masks. When using OSPF, point to point links between routers do not need an IP address at each end, authentication and cleartext passwords can be used, and multicasting instead of broadcasting can be used. Some of the biggest differences between OSPF and RIP are that due to the L-S algorithm, all routers will end up with identical routing tables, it will be loop free, and there will be a fast response to topology changes.

**IS-IS: Intermediate System to Intermediate System**

IS-IS is the OSI standard IGP. It is used for routing CLNP (connectionless network protocol) packets. CLNP is an OSI protocol, which is similar to IP. IS-IS and OSPF are similar.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Art Unit: 2661

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-15, 19-21 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wing So (US 2002/0109879).

As shown in Figs. 1-5, 18, 21-22, 37-38, 44-49 Wing discloses peer discovery (sections 95; 190; 234-5, 341, 365), between optical (Fig. 18; e.g., 282, 297, 362) nodes, connecting optical nodes, with at least two trunks (sections 138; 414, 437), sending a packet including an ID (e.g., IP, sections 361; SONET or ATM packet headers or sections 169-170; 255, 327), using an in-band control channel (sections 136, 338, 451-2, 512, 604, 631, 636), having packet originate from a management controller (Fig. 5; commands from router, section 272; using control planes, sections 366, 383, 392-397, 408-410) or a port interface card (sections 174, 272, 574, 578), using an ID such as a router ID (sections 269, 943-4) or port number (e.g., sections 174, 574, 578), using an optical routing parameter (ATM VPI/VCI; light path ID, sections 255, 294, 331) including a VPN (ATM VPI/VCI; virtual fiber, section 294) or an OSPF ID (sections 100; 341, 605), forming a tunnel (secure path, Fig.

Art Unit: 2661

18; security, section 265; leasing optical paths, section 297, 366), and using IP packets (Fig. 22; e.g., sections 620, 632) and SONET (Fig. 21; e.g., sections 566, 780), as specified in claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-15, 19-21.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 4, 12, 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wing as set forth above.

Although Wing failed to particularly call for a trunk manager module (not further defined in the claims) on the controller (not further defined in the claims), it is obvious that because Wing discloses performance monitoring and managing (sections 285, 297), OSPF topology discovery (section 341), network management (section 939), and using control planes (sections, 382, 392-397, 408-410) wherein the components of the control plane can be modules (section 397) that manager modules (software, subroutines, etc.) such as one disclosed as

Art Unit: 2661

performing routing, monitoring, or managing could be on the controller (running on top of the control plane) or part of the controlling software because Wing discloses extensive network management, routing software and combining programs would make unit more flexible and have more options.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David R Vincent whose telephone number is 571 272 3080. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau Nguyen can be reached on 571 272 3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DAVID VINCENT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

*David Vincent* 3/17/05

Application/Control Number: 09/865,112

Page 7

Art Unit: 2661

David R Vincent  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2661

March 17, 2005